

STAT

Approved For Release 2009/03/23 : CIA-RDP94B00280R001200010012-2

Page Denied

Approved For Release 2009/03/23 : CIA-RDP94B00280R001200010012-2

TRANSMITTAL SLIP			03 JUL 1984
TO:			
C/SECOM			
ROOM NO.	BUILDING		
REMARKS:			
Initial reaction.			
FROM:			
ExDir			
ROOM NO.	BUILDING	EXTENSION	

Initiatives to Combat Unauthorized Disclosures of Classified Intelligence Information

I. Investigation: Good--if implemented, much of II and III would follow or be moot.

II. Most basic is personnel security: that statement should be in Introductory paragraph. The items listed in II.A. tend to decrease the seriousness of other sections.

I do not like II.A.c) at all--it will never be understood by initiated DDI analysts, to say nothing of outsiders; I would delete it (it is also contrary to "multi-disciplinary analysis and SAFE design trends). The others are motherhood and cyclically problems.

In fact IIA(a), (b) are classical security whipping boys, not addressing real problem: very great percentage of leaks are at AsstSecy or higher levels; only get at problem if willing to investigate, use tools of trade and prosecute. Dissem controls et al are not the issue (witness current Iran/Iraq PDB case).

II B is SOP in CIA. So could a) and c) be elsewhere; b) could be in Intelligence Community buildings--not sure elsewhere. Re d): in CIA only DCI/DDCI/PAO should give backgrounders--so guidelines and indoctrination moot; other guidance OK.

III. Public not the target: State, Defense, NSC, Congress need education--and not, as noted, via briefings, but with convincing cases. Congress should be public's surrogate--public does not have the "right to know."

III A. Don't oppose but not sanguine: education would be superficial and much leaked information is deliberate for political or bureaucratic axe-grinding purposes.

III B: Agree (see above). Doubt feasibility of "realistic exercises" for senior levels briefed.

III C: Disagree (see above): public wrong target. Better focus by PAOs et al for inter-and intra-Government educating good idea.

IV A. Agree with desirability. Only ask if, tactically, this is too much while we're trying to sell Section I.

IV B. Sympathize, but am not in favor of this.